No. 46765-8-II

COURT OF APPEALS, DIVISION II OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

VS.

Phyllis Holman,

Appellant.

Cowlitz County Superior Court Cause No. 14-1-00339-8
The Honorable Judge Michael Evans

Appellant's Supplemental Brief

Jodi R. Backlund Manek R. Mistry Skylar T. Brett Attorneys for Appellant

BACKLUND & MISTRY

P.O. Box 6490 Olympia, WA 98507 (360) 339-4870 backlundmistry@gmail.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	. i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
TABLE OF MCTHORTLES	
ISSUES AND ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR	1
ISSUES AND ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR	ı
STATEMENT OF FACTS AND PRIOR PROCEEDINGS	2
STATEMENT OF FACTS AND PRIOR PROCEEDINGS	
A DOMANIENTE	•
ARGUMENT	. 2
The trial court erred by ordering Ms. Holman to pay \$2275 in	ı
legal financial obligations without inquiring into her	
ability to pay	2
CONCLUSION	4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

WASHINGTON STATE CASES	
State v. Blazina, 182 Wn.2d 827, 344 P.3d 680 (2015)	3, 4
WASHINGTON STATUTES	
RCW 10.01.160	3
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
GR 34	3
RAP 2.5	4

ISSUES AND ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR

- 1. The court erred by ordering Ms. Holman to pay \$2275 in legal financial obligations absent any inquiry into whether she had the means to do so.
- 2. The court erred by entering finding of fact 2.5. CP 24.

ISSUE 1: A court may not order a person to pay legal financial obligations (LFOs) without conducting an individualized inquiry into his/her means to do so. Did the court err by ordering Ms. Holman to pay \$2275 in LFOs while also finding her indigent and without analyzing whether she had the money to pay?

STATEMENT OF FACTS AND PRIOR PROCEEDINGS

At sentencing, the court did not conduct any inquiry into Phyllis Holman's financial situation. RP 164-175.

Still, the court ordered her to pay \$2275 in legal financial obligations. CP 25. The court also found Ms. Holman indigent for purposes of appeal. CP 45-47.

Ms. Holman timely appealed. CP 33-44.

ARGUMENT

THE TRIAL COURT ERRED BY ORDERING MS. HOLMAN TO PAY \$2275 IN LEGAL FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS WITHOUT INQUIRING INTO HER ABILITY TO PAY.

Ms. Holman was found indigent at the end of trial. CP 45-47. Still, the court ordered her to pay \$2275 in legal financial obligations (LFOs). CP 25.

The court appeared to rely on boilerplate language in the Judgment and Sentence stating, essentially, that every offender has the ability to pay LFOs. CP 24. But the court did not conduct any particularized inquiry into Ms. Holman's financial situation at sentencing or at any other time. RP 164-175. The court erred by ordering Ms. Holman to pay LFOs absent any indication that she had the means to do so.

The legislature has mandated that "[t]he court *shall not* order a defendant to pay costs unless the defendant is or will be able to pay them." RCW 10.01.160(3); *State v. Blazina*, 182 Wn.2d 827, 841, 344 P.3d 680 (2015) (emphasis added by court).

This imperative language prohibits a trial court form ordering LFOs absent an individualized inquiry into the person's ability to pay. *Id.* Boilerplate language in the Judgment and Sentence is inadequate because it does not demonstrate that the court engaged in an individualized analysis. *Id.*

The court must consider personal factors such as incarceration, the person's other debts (including restitution), and the receipt of means-tested benefits. *Id*.

Here, the court failed to conduct any meaningful inquiry into Ms. Holman's ability to pay LFOs. RP 164-175. The court did not consider her financial status in any way. Indeed, the court also found Ms. Holman indigent at the end of the proceeding. RP 45-47.

The *Blazina* court suggested that an indigent person would likely never be able to pay LFOs. *Id.* at 839 ("[I]f someone does meet the GR 34 standard for indigency, courts should seriously question that person's ability to pay LFOs"). Ms. Holman was determined to be indigent at both the beginning and the end of the proceedings in trial court. CP 45-46.

RAP 2.5(a) permits an appellate court to review errors even when they are not raised in the trial court. RAP 2.5(a); *Blazina*, 182 Wn.2d at 835. The *Blazina* court recently chose to review the LFO-related issue raised in this case, finding that "National and local cries for reform of broken LFO systems demand that this court exercise its RAP 2.5(a) discretion and reach the merits of this case." *Id*.

The Supreme Court noted the significant disparities both nationally and in Washington in the administration of LFOs and the significant barriers they place to reentry of society. *Id.* at 835-36. This court should follow the Supreme Court's lead and consider the merits of Ms. Holman's LFO claim even though it was not raised below.

The court erred by ordering Ms. Holman to pay \$2275 in LFOs absent any showing that she had the means to do so. *Blazina*, 182 Wn.2d at 841. The order must be vacated and the case remanded for a new sentencing hearing. *Id*.

CONCLUSION

The court erred by ordering Ms. Holman to pay \$2275 in legal financial obligations without any inquiry into her means to do so. Ms. Holman's case must be remanded for resentencing.

Respectfully submitted on June 30, 2015,

BACKLUND AND MISTRY

Jodi R. Backlund, WSBA No. 22917 Attorney for the Appellant

Manek R. Mistry, WSBA No. 22922 Attorney for the Appellant

Skylar T. Brett, WSBA No. 45475

Attorney for Appellant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on today's date:

I mailed a copy of Appellant's Supplemental Brief, postage prepaid, to:

Phyllis Holman 546 17th Ave Longview, WA 98632

With the permission of the recipient(s), I delivered an electronic version of the brief, using the Court's filing portal, to:

Cowlitz County Prosecuting Attorney appeals@co.cowlitz.wa.us

I filed the Appellant's Supplemental Brief electronically with the Court of Appeals, Division II, through the Court's online filing system.

I CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Signed at Olympia, Washington on June 30, 2015.

Jodi R. Backlund, WSBA No. 22917

Attorney for the Appellant

BACKLUND & MISTRY

June 30, 2015 - 11:28 AM

Transmittal Letter

Docume	ent Uploaded: 3-467658-Supplemental Appellant's Brief.pdf		
Case Na	ame: State v. Phyllis Holman f Appeals Case Number: 46765-8		
Is this a Personal Restraint Petition? Yes No			
The document being Filed is:			
	Designation of Clerk's Papers Supplemental Designation of Clerk's Papers		
	Statement of Arrangements		
$\tilde{\circ}$	Motion:		
	Answer/Reply to Motion:		
	Brief: Supplemental Appellant's		
	Statement of Additional Authorities		
	Cost Bill		
	Objection to Cost Bill		
	Affidavit		
	Letter		
	Copy of Verbatim Report of Proceedings - No. of Volumes: Hearing Date(s):		
	Personal Restraint Petition (PRP)		
	Response to Personal Restraint Petition		
	Reply to Response to Personal Restraint Petition		
	Petition for Review (PRV)		
	Other:		
Comments:			
No Comments were entered.			
Sender Name: Manek R Mistry - Email: <u>backlundmistry@gmail.com</u>			
A copy of this document has been emailed to the following addresses:			
appe	appeals@co.cowlitz.wa.us		